

The Times-DiPATCH

DAILY-SEVEN-DAY

Business Office.....\$10.00
 Daily with Sunday.....\$10.00
 Daily without Sunday.....\$10.00
 Sunday edition only.....\$10.00
 Weekly (Wednesday).....\$10.00

By Times-DiPATCH Carrier Delivery
 Service in Richmond and suburbs, Manches-
 ter and Petersburg—

One Week
 Daily with Sunday.....\$10.00
 Daily without Sunday.....\$10.00
 Sunday only.....\$10.00

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond,
 Va., as second-class matter under act of
 Congress of March 3, 1879.

TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 1910.

POLITICAL PARTIES OF TO-MORROW.

The life of a political party follows the same course as the life of a man. Feeble in its theories, weak in its policies, and uncertain of itself, every party has to pass through a period of infancy. Then, gradually, as it learns its power, it gains strength. It waxes mighty; it achieves great victories; it reaches its summit; it grows confident of its stability, and then it begins to decline. Gradually its followers desert it, gradually its leaders lose their skill, until it totters and falls.

American history is filled with the biographies, so to speak, of such parties. The Federalists, founded by Washington and organized by Hamilton, had their period of youthful vigor, their period of full strength, their political death in the Era of Good Feeling. The Whig party, which sprang from the old Federalist party, and numbered among its followers some of the greatest minds of America, had its rise, its glory and its decline, until it, too, died when sectional issues rent America. The American party, born with the death of the Whigs, had its brief career, flourished, won its victories, weakened, died and was forgotten. With these three parties might be numbered several of lesser fame powerful in their day and turning the whole cycle of political usefulness, but passing in turn and disappearing forever.

It begins to look as though the Republican party has reached the zenith of its power and is beginning to feel its approaching end. Its old-time leaders are sickening of the fight, its ablest men are in despair, and within its ranks there are discord and discontent. Already the Progressives have organized themselves and have practically assumed a new party name, and but a few days ago there came vague rumors of a new party, formed among former Republicans, but aiming at the overthrow of the men in power.

With the passing of the Republicans, there has been the rise of the Socialists. They have been poorly led and their own dissensions have weakened them when they should have been waxing stronger every day, but they must certainly be numbered among the forces of the future. When their vote has passed the half million mark and when they are gaining in municipal and State elections all over the country, only the opportunist can laugh at them, and only the blind can fail to see their menace.

Between these two parties—the declining Republican party and the growing Socialist party—stands the Democratic party. It, too, must follow the course of all its predecessors and must have its full cycle of life, but as yet it is in the full prime of its strength. The principles for which it stood in its youth are the principles which will save the country to-day, and the fields on which its greatest victories have been won are the fields on which the battles of to-morrow will be fought.

It is between the three forces represented by these parties, if not between the parties as they now exist, that the political future of the country depends. There will always be conservatives—men who mark time and never advance to meet conditions as they are—and there will always be radicals, quick to seize on new devices, always ready to avail themselves of every trade wind of political prosperity. There will always be a great body of reasoning men, midway between these extremes, upon whose decision the fate of this Government will rest. The Republican forces, by whatever name they may be called in the future, will be the conservatives; the Socialists will be the radicals; and the Democrats will be the Moderates, holding, perhaps, the balance of power, and holding certainly the surest position. Upon the party of the Constitution, the Constitution will depend, and upon the loyalty of Democrats to-day will depend the stability of Democracy to-morrow.

A NEW MCKENBURG MYTH.

We had not intended to say a word about it, and but for the interference of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot in a wholly personal matter we should have refrained from exposing the last of the North Carolina fables. A week or so ago, there was a celebration in Charlotte. Four local organizations turned out to do the occasion honor—the McKenburgh Camp of Confederate Veterans, the Daughters of the Confederacy, the Sons of the Confederacy and the Children of the Confederacy. It will be noted that the mothers-in-law of the Confederacy, the Uncles and Aunts and Cousins were absent, but there were about two hundred persons present to participate in what the Charlotte Observer called "the Commemorative Exercises." The celebration took place on the birthday of Jefferson Davis, June 20, and the occasion was the placing on the wall of the Seaboard Railway freight depot in Charlotte a shaft-shaped tablet

bearing the inscription, "Confederate States Navy Yard, Charlotte, North Carolina, 1862-1865." That is the inscription alleged to have been placed on the tablet, but as a matter of fact, the Observer could not tell the truth—the historical truth, we mean—about the tablet, because the tablet bears the figures "1861-1865."

Dates do not matter to the people of McKenburgh County. They will put up a tablet to any old thing at any old time and go through the form of celebrating the event with prayer and praise and high-sounding speech. It was so on this occasion. "Dr. Bays offered a most impressive and solemn prayer," and although nothing is said about it in the Observer's story of it, we should not be surprised if some one "raised the tune."

Doubtless there was a shop at Charlotte of some sort during the sixties—there are a great many shops there now, all of which we are glad to note are doing a fine business—but the Navy Yard at Charlotte was no more a Navy Yard than chalk is cheese, or oleomargarine butter. Indeed, the Charlotte Observer admits that "at the time this yard had practically dwindled to nothing, so most of the work was done for the Army," which, of course, made it a navy yard.

If it is not too late, we would suggest that the figures "1861" be chiseled off the bronze plate and that the figures "1862" be welded in their place.

Mr. E. R. Preston, a good Virginia name, by the way, delivered the oration at the Navy Yard celebration, and when he had finished the strings were pulled and the red and white covering "exposed the metal tablet," exposing at the same time the predating of the tablet, just as Wickham is alleged by Henry Waterson to have predicated his "Horderau" in the Ballinger hearing. Then, according to the voracious chronicle of this incident in the historical inaccuracies of McKenburgh County, "the Rev. W. W. Bays dismissed the crowd with the short benediction."

It will be news to a great many persons to know that Charlotte was ever the Capital of the Southern Confederacy, and to know that "the last deliberations of the Government were held and its final acts signed and sealed in what is now the Observer Building." As a matter of fact the last action of the Confederate Government was taken at Washington, Ga., and the last full Cabinet meeting of the Confederacy was held in the residence of Armistead Burke, Abbeville, South Carolina. It does not matter, though, to the people of Charlotte and McKenburgh County whether Mr. Davis was ever in Charlotte or not. They are all sure, soon or late, if their present wind holds out, to erect a tablet, possibly in the wall of the Observer Building, saying that here in 1862 the Southern Confederacy passed out of existence.

GENEROUS JOURNALISM.

The spirit of Sir Philip Sidney survives even in the Ninth District. About a week ago the Roanoke World printed an editorial article in reference to the congressional campaign now in progress in that district. What it said was not agreeable to the Roanoke Times, which expressed its dissent in rather sharp terms. Naturally the World resented the criticism and prepared a reply to what the Times had said, defending its own position and contentions. Upon reflection, however, the World reached the conclusion that what it had written might do harm to the Democratic cause, and, therefore, despite its grievance, suppressed its speech. This fact having come to the knowledge of the Times, without any suggestion whatever from its contemporary, the editor of the Times, the same being Alfred Brockenbrough Williams, met the occasion by saying:

"We think fairness requires us to say, as we happen to know that its (the World's) silence in the face of the approach of an attack of the Roanoke Times is honorable self-restraint at the risk of its own injury and of being misunderstood, and is for motives creditable to its feeling and judgment, and which all good citizens must approve."

That is the nearest thing we have known for a long time in the journalism of this country, and it is worth noting for the purpose of encouraging that generous spirit in journalism which inures not only to the honor of the profession, but to the advantage of the public.

WOMEN AS JURORS.

A London Police Magistrate started his colleagues the other day by proposing that all divorce cases be heard before mixed juries of men and women. He saw no reason why women should be excluded from this service, but he declared there was one overwhelming reason why they should be on the juries: their presence in the court room and their right to pass on the merits of a divorce case would tend to make men careful in their testimony. No man, he said, would dare ask for a divorce from a jury on which women were sitting and offer such testimony as was commonly given before the courts of London.

If the presence of women on divorce juries will prevent the washing of filthy domestic linen in court, the experiment is worth trying, but there is another reason why the Police Magistrate's suggestion deserves consideration: a woman is the best judge of her kind. A jury of more or less stupid men, sitting in court, is not always correct in its estimate of the credibility of witnesses, and especially are male jurors deceived by women on the stand. For some reason, the average man, in listening to the testimony of a woman, instinctively takes her at her word, unless the falsehood of her statements is most evident. Women would be more careful and more discriminating. Knowing the ways of their sex, they would be able

almost at a glance, to tell whether or not a woman was giving true testimony, and for this reason they would certainly be of service to their less acute colleagues on the jury.

It will, of course, be said that women have no place on a divorce jury, as their sympathy is quickly aroused and as they naturally side with the woman in the case. This, however, is only true with strict limitations. To be sure, a woman is sympathetic, but a woman on a jury could hardly be more emotional than some of the men who sit in the box, always ready to overflow in tears. So far as siding with the woman is concerned, every man knows that a woman is jealous of the honor of her sex, and is at least as prone to condemn its wayward members as a man is. Of course, a woman juror would protest against such divorce railroadings as we have in this country—litigation that often condemns a good woman unheard and fixes a stigma on her when she is spotless—yet where the woman was the real offender, a woman would not fail to be her judge.

This is the day of women's rights and of women's duties. If she want the rights, she must assume the duties, and if she would vote, she should perhaps do jury service. If we are to have divorce laws of any sort—and we should have none save that of Scripture—we do not doubt that women would discharge their duty in such cases at least as well as the men who now sit on men's sins and women's failings in England.

"BARBAROUS MEXICO" AGAIN.

Somehow, the stories which have been circulating about "Barbarous Mexico" will not down. President Diaz and all his official organs may deny the charges of peonage in Yucatan, the men who preferred the charges may be denounced as muck-rakers, and friends of Mexico may parade the virtues of that Government, but the same stories of cruelty are drifting across the Texan boundary.

The latest of these comes from John Kenneth Turner, whose sensational articles printed last year raised such a storm. Testifying Saturday before a special committee of the House, Turner declared that Mexican refugees, fleeing from Diaz's autocratic despotism, had been illegally arrested in this country and returned without extradition. He cited cases, he called names and he appeared so positive of his facts that he apparently made a deep impression on the committee.

So far as these charges themselves are concerned, they can easily be disposed of. If Turner can prove his case, prison terms await the guilty men; if he fail to show any conspiracy to illegally return Mexican refugees, this Government's hands are clean. At any event, the matter will be sifted to the bottom. The truth or the untruth of what Turner and others allege about slavery in Mexico is a different matter. If what they say be true, or if even the half of it be true, Mexico is a disgrace to North America and its government is a discredit to civilization. If they are libeling the Mexican authorities, they should be hushed at once, and should stand discredited forever. The trouble is that nobody in Mexico seems willing to show the real facts in the case. The few adventurers who have sought to make an investigation have been unceremoniously escorted to the frontier, and the Mexican Government, aside from entering a general denial, has not offered to show that peonage does not exist in Mexico.

The United States cannot dictate to Mexico, and no other power can demand of that nation that it put an end to slavery, but international sentiment which has banished slavery in a hundred lands is certainly strong enough to force Mexico to better conduct, if that country be guilty of wrong doing. Humanity is demanding an explanation.

TRANSFORMING CHEMISTRY.

Chemists the world over have to rewrite their list of elements since the Congress of German Chemists has adjourned at Munich. Six new elements have been discovered and six strange names will have to be added to the long list of law-breakers which puzzle everybody but those born to pronounce them.

The discoverer of the new elements is Doctor Auer von Welsbach, who already has a long line of scientific achievements to his credit and who has previously contributed to chemistry not less than four new elements. The six which Dr. Welsbach announced to the world at the Munich meeting have been separated from tellurium and thulium, from dysprosium and gadolinum, and they "increase the number of elementary rare earths from sixteen to twenty-two."

Dr. Welsbach did not seem to know of what good these new elements would be to the world, and if he did not, we are sure we can throw no light on the subject, but their discovery is interesting on principle as an addition to science and doubly interesting at this time, when chemistry is passing through a great period of change. Twenty years ago, chemists were pretty well settled in their own minds that they knew about all there was to know of their subject. They had been a sort of vanguard of science anyway, and they were the first to reach what they thought was their journey's end. In those days it was not unusual for a chemist to say that while there were new compounds to be examined and new processes to be studied, the basis of chemistry was established for all time.

To-day there is hardly a chemist who can look back twenty years without feeling ashamed of his own ignorance. In that benighted day, new elements have been found, new compounds have been made, and the very foundation of chemistry has been shaken. When the discovery of the electron upset much of the old atomic theory, and when radio-activity confounded every law of chemistry

and physics, even the most conservative of scientists felt their foundation shake. Since that time, new investigations have merely confused the minds of men and baffled their investigations. He is a daring chemist to-day who will predict the status of his science to-morrow.

All of this has much more than an academic interest, since the recent discoveries of chemistry have indicated the great industrial possibilities of future researches. The possibilities of radium alone, which are as yet unfathomed, may revolutionize motive power, while the advances of physical chemistry may make the darkest problems of electricity an open book.

BABY'S NAME SHOULD LIVE.

There was something very pathetic about the little story of George W. Bagby printed yesterday in The Times-DiPATCH. The editor of Life, which quotes all sorts of things without a reason, reprinted an article the other day which it called "How Ruby Played," and which it attributed to "An Anonymous Writer." Some Southern man, who read the sketch, wrote the editor of Life, claiming the article for Dr. Bagby and adding a few words of praise for that strange genius. To him, and to all who have ever read a word that Bagby wrote, it will appear as little short of amazing that the works of the great Southern humorist should so soon have been forgotten, even in the North.

If there is any claim to immortality for the man who brings a smile to his brother's lips, and if there is any fame for the man who masters his mother tongue and uses it with subtle force, both fame and immortality should belong to Bagby. He was a genius, gifted with a humor not less delightful than that of Mark Twain, and he was master of a style the equal of any America has seen since Irving died. He was a dramatist, too, and a poet, at heart, full of gentleness and kindness to all the world, patient in suffering, brave in adversity, cheerful in adversity.

No one who ever chanced on the two volumes of Dr. Bagby's collected writings ever put them down until he had read the last line, and nobody ever closed the books without a deep admiration for the man. Where, in all American literature, is there a more delightful sketch than "Bacon and Greens"? Where is there more exalted sentiment than in his "Old Virginia Gentleman"? Where is there more genuine pathos and more fervid imagination than in his little sketch of the old Presbyterian Church, turned into a furniture store?

Surely, Bagby's characters must not be buried in oblivion, and his name must not be forgotten. The Southern people should know "Mozz Addums" as they know "Uncle Remus," and they should cherish his other immortal tales in the same shrine with "Marse Chan" and "Uncle Edinburg." They should know that that Cathedral which Bagby proposed to build at Fifth and Main Streets, where music should be the only worship and song the only thanks to God; they should not forget "Fomville" as he painted it, or that great station to be built at Gordonsville; and every Southern child should know the story of the "Twins."

Nor should Bagby's claim to a place in American literature be trusted only to the fidelity of the Southern people. He lived in troublous days, and he wrote when a Southern man had little chance with a Northern publisher, and a Southern speaker had few hearers when he mounted a Northern rostrum; but in the future, when prejudice shall not dominate history and justice shall write the annals of American literature, his name should be loved and honored, and he should not be quoted in a comic weekly as an "Anonymous Writer."

It is a great thing to have visitors from the country districts of South Carolina and Georgia occasionally, and the oftener, the better, because they can get in Richmond a taste of real life that is not to be experienced in Augusta and Florence. Where the mischief is Florence? Why, in South Carolina, to be sure. Florence is the place where they have pinback fair stew, and nobody who has ever participated in them ever wishes to be caught again, because there is a limit even to human endurance.

"Owned a dozen silk hats in Texas during the past quarter of a century," indeed! There haven't been a dozen silk hats in Texas since Texas was a Territory, or worse still, an independent Republic.

We are reminded by an anonymous postal card that the Chicago Tribune cannot be depended upon to give all the facts in the case of Lorimer. Perhaps so; but it has given enough facts to justify the special committee of the Senate in resorting to extreme measures to find out the facts. "Facts are stubborn things," as Henry Waterson would say, and so far the facts appear to be against Lorimer. Besides, what's one Lorimer, more or less?

It turns out that Carpenter was "raised" 66 per cent, when he was transplanted from Washington to Morocco, which, we imagine, will compensate Carpenter for any sorrow he may have felt at parting with Captain Archie Butt.

William C. Proctor has renewed his gift of \$500,000 to Princeton, and President Woodrow Wilson has waived his objections to the gift. It is not to be wondered at. Any man would feel kindly disposed to all the world after raking in that Wyman gift.

and seem small achievements to the men who made the journeys. Baron Roenne may be wrong, but he may be right, and he should at least be permitted to make his experiments.

It is interesting to observe, in this connection, how closely we are following the dreams of the novelists. All that Verne hoped for in his "Twenty Thousand Leagues" is not yet achieved, but our submarines are in active service and are showing their seaworthy qualities at every test. All that Kipling predicted in his "With the Night Mail" is still in the making, but Roenne plans to fulfil it, and fulfil it precisely as Kipling dreamed it.

BAGBY'S NAME SHOULD LIVE.

There was something very pathetic about the little story of George W. Bagby printed yesterday in The Times-DiPATCH. The editor of Life, which quotes all sorts of things without a reason, reprinted an article the other day which it called "How Ruby Played," and which it attributed to "An Anonymous Writer." Some Southern man, who read the sketch, wrote the editor of Life, claiming the article for Dr. Bagby and adding a few words of praise for that strange genius. To him, and to all who have ever read a word that Bagby wrote, it will appear as little short of amazing that the works of the great Southern humorist should so soon have been forgotten, even in the North.

If there is any claim to immortality for the man who brings a smile to his brother's lips, and if there is any fame for the man who masters his mother tongue and uses it with subtle force, both fame and immortality should belong to Bagby. He was a genius, gifted with a humor not less delightful than that of Mark Twain, and he was master of a style the equal of any America has seen since Irving died. He was a dramatist, too, and a poet, at heart, full of gentleness and kindness to all the world, patient in suffering, brave in adversity, cheerful in adversity.

No one who ever chanced on the two volumes of Dr. Bagby's collected writings ever put them down until he had read the last line, and nobody ever closed the books without a deep admiration for the man. Where, in all American literature, is there a more delightful sketch than "Bacon and Greens"? Where is there more exalted sentiment than in his "Old Virginia Gentleman"? Where is there more genuine pathos and more fervid imagination than in his little sketch of the old Presbyterian Church, turned into a furniture store?

Surely, Bagby's characters must not be buried in oblivion, and his name must not be forgotten. The Southern people should know "Mozz Addums" as they know "Uncle Remus," and they should cherish his other immortal tales in the same shrine with "Marse Chan" and "Uncle Edinburg." They should know that that Cathedral which Bagby proposed to build at Fifth and Main Streets, where music should be the only worship and song the only thanks to God; they should not forget "Fomville" as he painted it, or that great station to be built at Gordonsville; and every Southern child should know the story of the "Twins."

Nor should Bagby's claim to a place in American literature be trusted only to the fidelity of the Southern people. He lived in troublous days, and he wrote when a Southern man had little chance with a Northern publisher, and a Southern speaker had few hearers when he mounted a Northern rostrum; but in the future, when prejudice shall not dominate history and justice shall write the annals of American literature, his name should be loved and honored, and he should not be quoted in a comic weekly as an "Anonymous Writer."

It is a great thing to have visitors from the country districts of South Carolina and Georgia occasionally, and the oftener, the better, because they can get in Richmond a taste of real life that is not to be experienced in Augusta and Florence. Where the mischief is Florence? Why, in South Carolina, to be sure. Florence is the place where they have pinback fair stew, and nobody who has ever participated in them ever wishes to be caught again, because there is a limit even to human endurance.

"Owned a dozen silk hats in Texas during the past quarter of a century," indeed! There haven't been a dozen silk hats in Texas since Texas was a Territory, or worse still, an independent Republic.

We are reminded by an anonymous postal card that the Chicago Tribune cannot be depended upon to give all the facts in the case of Lorimer. Perhaps so; but it has given enough facts to justify the special committee of the Senate in resorting to extreme measures to find out the facts. "Facts are stubborn things," as Henry Waterson would say, and so far the facts appear to be against Lorimer. Besides, what's one Lorimer, more or less?

It turns out that Carpenter was "raised" 66 per cent, when he was transplanted from Washington to Morocco, which, we imagine, will compensate Carpenter for any sorrow he may have felt at parting with Captain Archie Butt.

William C. Proctor has renewed his gift of \$500,000 to Princeton, and President Woodrow Wilson has waived his objections to the gift. It is not to be wondered at. Any man would feel kindly disposed to all the world after raking in that Wyman gift.

Daily Queries and Answers

Address all communications for this column to Query Editor, Times-DiPATCH. No mathematical problems will be solved, no coins or stamps valued and no dealers' names will be given.

Buck's Stove Case.

Please give me the history and present status of the Buck's Stove case, involving officers of the American Federation of Labor.

The Buck's Stove and Range Company secured two injunctions, the first in December, 1907, and March, 1908. In the Supreme Court in the District of Columbia against certain officers of the American Federation of Labor, late in December, 1908, President Gompers, Vice-President Schenck and Secretary Morris of the Federation, had been convicted by that court of violating the injunction, Justice Wright rendering the decision, and had been sentenced to imprisonment for one year, nine months and six months, respectively. In that case, at which Alton B. Parker appeared for the Federation, the latter had taken the position that the original injunction was wrongly granted, being an injunction of the kind of force and effect, and therefore in excess of the power of the court issuing it; that therefore a violation of the injunction was done at the time of the contempt of court as shown by the citation of numerous judicial opinions, but that they recognized that disobeying an order was done at the time, and though they were willing to sacrifice personal freedom in order to secure a determination of the rights of speech and press to be enjoyed by union labor, Justice Wright having upheld the injunction and severely sentenced the officers, there were two issues before the labor leaders—first, an appeal to determine the legality of the original injunction, and secondly, an appeal from the sentence of imprisonment. In order to take these matters to higher courts, the executive council of the Federation on March 1, 1909, issued a statement for funds to organized labor, its friends and sympathizers. On March 11, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which these matters had been taken by a majority of two to one, rendered a decision sustaining the injunction, but greatly reducing its extent. The validity of the injunction involved the definition of a boycott, and for it was to restrain any alleged boycott that the order was originally issued. Justice Robb, who rendered the majority opinion, reviewed the history of the case, and cited numerous opinions to establish in the nature of a boycott as a "combination to harm a person by coercing others to harm him," and he declared to constitute a boycott so defined, and therefore an illegal restraint of trade, the order which he had rendered. He also stated that while the courts have refused to enforce the publication of a libel, they have freely enforced both written and oral statements of facts, and the means of carrying out an unlawful combination. The court therefore upheld the lawfulness of the injunction in so far as it prohibited the use of the Buck's Company in the "Unfair"

or "We Don't Patronize" lists of the Federation, and any other official utterances made "in furtherance of the boycott"; but the decision declared any additional interference with the business or publications of the Federation to be beyond the court's power.

The appeal from the decision of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, rendered by Justice Wright in the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction. On this ground the judgment was affirmed. While regretting the severity of the imprisonment sentences, they held that the affirmation of the rules of procedure of the contempt proceedings, taken before the same court, was decided on November 10. The court was again divided. Justices Van Orsdel and Robb, holding the proceedings to be criminal, refused to take cognizance of any appeal from the contempt proceedings of the labor leaders with reference to disobedience to the original injunction.